



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

HJA

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,062	09/05/2003	Kimihiko Kazui	FULO 20.622	8536
26304	7590	09/20/2006	EXAMINER	
KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP 575 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585				VUU, HENRY
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2179		

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/656,062	KAZUI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Henry Vuu	2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Sept. 5, 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date Sept. 5, 2003.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1 – 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the registration", in which the process of registration by use of the cooperative work system does not clearly teach how to accomplish the process of registering in any subsequent claims. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 2 – 6 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as they depend upon a rejected independent claim

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in(1) an application for patent, published under section 122 (b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for

patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351 (a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8 – 11, 13, 14, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Maurille et al. (Patent No. 6,484,196).

As to independent claim 1, Maurille et al teaches:

A multimedia cooperative work system (communication board system – see e.g., column 2, lines 52 – 58), comprising: generating a model of a multimedia electronic tag (DisplayNames – see e.g., column 11, lines 11 – 17; i.e., the generation of UserIDs “U007, U019 and U027” corresponds to names “Arnie, Robert and SueEllen” displayed on the communication board system respectively) in which display of a comment (MsgText 406 – see e.g., Fig. 4B; i.e., the comments corresponds to user input comments in the communication board system) and attribute data (MsgTimeStamp 242 – see e.g., Fig. 4B and column 8, line 37 – 39; i.e., wherein the date and time corresponds to the attribute) thereof/comment input in tree-shape structure (see e.g., Fig. 4B and column 13, lines 12 – 28; i.e., the comments inputted by the multiple users of the communication board system includes indentations of each comment to show a tree shape hierarchy structure regarding to first, second and third level) is possible for each scene of multimedia data (402, 404, 406 – see e.g., Fig. 4B; i.e., the combination of 402, 404, and 406 corresponds to a single scene of multimedia data within the communication board system), the registration

(registers participants – see e.g., column 6, line 33) of which is requested by an arbitrary client in a server (see e.g., column 3, lines 2 – 15; i.e., the communication board system is a client server system) and which are obtained by dividing multimedia data in terms of time (MsgTimeStamp 242 – see e.g., Fig. 4B and column 8, line 37 – 39; i.e., each multimedia data comment inputted by individual users invoke “MsgTimeStamp” command, which post different time and date attributes to each post); and exchanging comments on each scene among a plurality of clients (multiple users - see e.g., column 3, line 49 – 65), including the requesting client , using the multimedia electronic tag, thereby realizing multimedia cooperative work (see e.g., column 11, lines 8 – 39).

As to independent claim 8, Maurille et al. teaches:
A server (server 100 – see e.g., Fig. 1 and column 3, lines 2 – 15), comprising: a communication unit (communication application 117 – see e.g., column 6, line 2 – 3) transmitting/receiving data to/from each client (transmitting – see e.g., column 7, lines 1 – 10; i.e., server application 114 transmits to client 150 communication board information and messages using server memory 106 executed by server processor 102) through a network (network 160 – see e.g., column 6, lines 58 – 67); and a multimedia electronic tag model generation unit (see e.g., column 10, lines 18 – 19; i.e., the server application 114 performs the operations listed from 3.4 – 3.14, in which the multimedia electronic tag generation is included in the list of operations) generating a model of a multimedia electronic tag (DisplayNames – see e.g., column 11, lines 11 – 17; i.e., the generation of UserIDs “U007, U019 and U027” corresponds to names

“Arnie, Robert and SueEllen” displayed on the communication board system respectively) in which display of a comment and attribute data thereof/comment (MsgText 406 – see e.g., Fig. 4B; i.e., the comments corresponds to user input comments in the communication board system) input in tree-shape structure (see e.g., Fig. 4B and column 13, lines 12 – 28; i.e., the comments inputted by the multiple users of the communication board system includes indentations of each comment to show a tree shape hierarchy structure regarding to first, second and third level) is possible for each scene (402, 404, 406 – see e.g., Fig. 4B; i.e., the combination of 402, 404, and 406 corresponds to a single scene of multimedia data within the communication board system) obtained by dividing multimedia data that is requested by an arbitrary client in a server (see e.g., column 3, lines 2 – 15; i.e., the communication board system is a client server system), in terms of time (MsgTimeStamp 242 – see e.g., Fig. 4B and column 8, line 37 – 39; i.e., each multimedia data comment inputted by individual users invoke “MsgTimeStamp” command, which post different time and date attributes to each post).

As to independent claim 11, Maurille et al. teaches:

A client (client 150 – see e.g., Fig. 1 and column 3, lines 2 – 15), comprising: a communication unit (web browser 168 - see e.g., column 7, line 21) transmitting/receiving (receives/transmits - see e.g., column 7, line 21) data to/from a sever (server application 114 - see e.g., column 7, line 23) or each client through a network (network – see e.g., column 6, lines 58 – 67); and a multimedia electronic tag editing unit (talk dialog screen 820 – see e.g., Fig. 8B;

i.e., talk dialog screen 820 resides on the client side by invoking client application 166 and browser 168) displaying a comment (MsgText 406 – see e.g., Fig. 4B; i.e., the comments corresponds to user input comments in the communication board system) with attribute data (MsgTimeStamp 242 – see e.g., Fig. 4B and column 8, line 37 – 39; i.e., wherein the date and time corresponds to the attribute) attached to each scene of multimedia data (402, 404, 406 – see e.g., Fig. 4B; i.e., the combination of 402, 404, and 406 corresponds to a single scene of multimedia data, including MsgTimeStamp 242 within the communication board system) corresponding to the multimedia electronic tag, using a multimedia electronic tag (DisplayNames – see e.g., column 11, lines 11 – 17) obtained from a server (server application 114 – see e.g., column 11, line 6; i.e., the multimedia electronic tag is assigned to the user by the server application) or another client, and simultaneously enabling a comment to be inputted to an arbitrary scene or a comment (see e.g., column 9, lines 56 - 63; i.e., a comment corresponds to a user sending a message by invoking the SEND request) and updating the content of the multimedia electronic tag, based on the input (see e.g., column 12, lines 3 - 23; i.e., the content of the multimedia electronic tag is updated in message table 142 to show the message has been posted on the communication board system).

As to independent claim 13, claim 13 only differs from claim 1 only in that claim 13 is a method of claim 1. Thus, claim 13 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1.

As to independent claim 14, Maurille et al. teaches:

A computer-readable storage medium (Client Memory 156 - see e.g., Fig. 1) that records a program (Applications 164 - see e.g., Fig. 1) enabling a computer (user's client computer - see e.g., see e.g., column 12, line 36) to execute a process (Client Processor 152 - see e.g., Fig. 1), the process comprising: displaying a comment (MsgText 406 – see e.g., Fig. 4B; i.e., the comments corresponds to user input comments in the communication board system) with a variety of attributes (MsgTimeStamp 242, Recipient 246, and SenderName 245 – see e.g., Fig. 4B and column 8, line 37 – 65; i.e., wherein the date, time, sender name, and recipient corresponds to the variety of attributes) of a writer user attached (SenderName 245 - see e.g., Fig. 4B; i.e., the senders name corresponds to the writer, which attaches the attributes to the communication board system) to each scene of multimedia data (402, 404, 406 – see e.g., Fig. 4B; i.e., the combination of 402, 404, and 406 corresponds to a single scene of multimedia data, including MsgTimeStamp 242 within the communication board system) corresponding to the multimedia electronic tag, using a multimedia electronic tag (DisplayNames – see e.g., column 11, lines 11 – 17) obtained from a server (server application 114— see e.g., column 11, line 6; i.e., the multimedia electronic tag is assigned to the user by the server application) or another client, and simultaneously enabling a comment to be inputted to an arbitrary scene or a comment (see e.g., column 9, lines 56 - 63; i.e., a comment corresponds to a user sending a message by invoking the SEND request) and updating a content of the multimedia electronic tag, based on the input (see e.g., column 12, lines 3 - 23; i.e., the content of the multimedia electronic tag is updated in message table

142 to show the message has been posted on the communication board system).

As to independent claim 16, claim 16 only differs from claim 1 only in that claim 16 is an apparatus claim using a program (Application Programs 112 - see e.g., column 5, lines 60 - 61) which is executed (Processor 102 - see e.g., column 5, line 62; i.e., application programs 112 are executed by processor 102) to perform the steps of claim 1. Thus, claim 16 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1.

As to independent claim 17, claim 17 only differs from claim 11 only in that claim 17 is an apparatus claim using a program (Application Programs 112 - see e.g., column 5, lines 60 - 61) which is executed (Processor 102 - see e.g., column 5, line 62; i.e., application programs 112 are executed by processor 102) to perform the steps of claim 11. Thus, claim 17 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 11.

As to dependent claim 2, Maurille et al. teaches:

The multimedia cooperative work system (communication board system – see e.g., column 2, lines 52 – 58) according to claim 1, wherein each said client (client – see e.g., column 3, lines 2 – 15) further comprises an electronic tag editing unit (talk dialog screen 820 – see e.g., Fig. 8B; i.e., talk dialog screen 820 resides on the client side by invoking client application 166 and browser 168) displaying a comment display/input screen (response input box 830 – see e.g., Fig. 4B and column 19 – lines 29 – 30), using a multimedia electronic tag (DisplayNames – see e.g., column 11, lines 11 – 17) obtained from the server

(server application 114— see e.g., column 11, line 6; i.e., the multimedia electronic tag is assigned to the user by the server application) or another client.

As to dependent claim 4, Maurille et al teaches:

The multimedia cooperative work system (communication board system – see e.g., column 2, lines 52 – 58) according to claim 1, wherein the attribute data include at least one of a comment writer name (SenderName 245 – see e.g., Fig. 4B and column 12, lines 47 – 55; i.e., the writer's name corresponds to "Mit" shown on the information line 420), a comment generation date (MsgTimeStamp 242 – see e.g., Fig. 4B and column 12, lines 47 – 55) and a comment adding destination (Recipient 246 – see e.g., Fig. 4B and column 12, lines 47 – 55).

As to dependent claim 5, Maurille et al. teaches:

The multimedia cooperative work system (communication board system – see e.g., column 2, lines 52 – 58) according to claim 2, wherein a publication destination (Recipient 256 - see e.g., Fig. 4B; i.e., the publication destination corresponds to the recipient to which the post is to be sent) of the comment (MsgText 406 – see e.g., Fig. 4B; i.e., the comments corresponds to user input comments in the communication board system) can be selected and designated (Participants 776 – see e.g., Fig. 7C; i.e., Participants 776 can be used to select and designate who to send comments to) in the comment display/input screen (Conference Mode Implementation 770 – see e.g., Fig. 7C), the multimedia electronic tag (DisplayNames – see e.g., column 11, lines 11 – 17; i.e., the generation of UserIDs "U007, U019 and U027" corresponds to names "Arnie, Robert and SueEllen" displayed on the communication board system

respectively) is updated by adding description on the publication destination and the multimedia electronic tag after the update is stored in the server (see e.g., Fig. 3A and column 3, lines 28 – 48; i.e., the PMB Database 108 resides in Server 100, which is responsible for storing and updating data regarding publication destination and multimedia tags), the server (Server 100 – see e.g., Fig. 1) further comprises an electronic tag communication unit (Communications Application – see e.g., Fig. 1 and column 6, lines 2 – 3) transmitting a multimedia electronic tag without comment (see e.g., column 12, lines 3 – 23; i.e., the user is able to use and view their communication board system instantly by using the multimedia electronic tag to log in without comments), the publication destinations of which are designated (Recipient 256 - see e.g., Fig. 4B; i.e., the publication destination corresponds to the recipient to which the post is to be sent), to the requesting client if the client requesting the transmission of the multimedia electronic tag is not included in the publication destinations (see e.g., Fig. 4B).

As to dependent claim 9, Maurille et al. teaches:

The server according to claim 8, further comprising a member management unit (Server Memory 106 - see e.g., Fig. 1) obtaining member data, which are data on a user engaging in the multimedia data cooperative work (Server Application 114 - see e.g., column 10, lines 18 - 67; i.e., Server Application 114 which resides in Server Memory 106 performs the operations of collecting and processing member data), from electronic mail by which the registration requesting client notifies other clients of the identifier of the multimedia data (see e.g., column 11,

lines 40 - 64; i.e., recipient/client application displays an alert window that allows the recipient to decide the acceptance of a message), and managing the member data in relation to the multimedia data and multimedia electronic tag (PMB Database 108 – see e.g., Fig. 1 and column 6, lines 44 – 57; i.e., the PMB Database 108 is responsible for managing the tables associated with member data and multimedia data), wherein said multimedia electronic tag model generation unit generates the multimedia electronic tag model using the data managed by the management unit (Sever Memory 106 – see e.g., Fig. 1).

As to dependent claim 10, Maurille et al teaches:

The server according to claim 8 or 9, wherein, a publication destination (Recipient 256 - see e.g., Fig. 4B; i.e., the publication destination corresponds to the recipient to which the post is to be sent) and expiration date of a comment are described as attribution data of the comment in the multimedia electronic tag (see e.g., column 12, lines 31 - 46; i.e., messages are displayed until they expire and are automatically deleted), and further comprising a multimedia electronic tag modification/communication unit deleting an overdue comment from a multimedia electronic tag (ExpiryDate - see e.g., Fig. 1 and column 8, line 43; i.e., is a flag that resides in PMB Database on the server side and is invoked to delete overdue messages from a multimedia electronic tag), or when receiving a multimedia electronic tag request from a client of an arbitrary member, transmitting the multimedia electronic tag without comment, the publication destination of which are not designated the requesting client, to the requesting client.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maurille et al (Patent No. 6,484,196) in view of Dodrill et al. (Patent No. 6,766,298).

As to dependent claim 6, Maurille et al. teaches a multimedia cooperative work system (communication board system - see e.g., column 2, lines 52 - 58), including the generation of a multimedia electronic tag models (DisplayNames – see e.g., column 11, lines 11 – 17; i.e., the generation of UserIDs “U007, U019 and U027” corresponds to names “Arnie, Robert and SueEllen” displayed on the communication board system respectively) that display comments (MsgText 406 – see e.g., Fig. 4B; i.e., the comments corresponds to user input comments in the communication board system) and attribute data, (MsgTimeStamp 242 – see e.g., Fig. 4B and column 8, line 37 – 39; i.e., wherein the date and time corresponds to the attribute) which is tree-shaped structured (see e.g., Fig. 4B

and column 13, lines 12 – 28; i.e., the comments inputted by the multiple users of the communication board system includes indentations of each comment to show a tree shape hierarchy structure regarding to first, second and third level) for each scene of multimedia data (402, 404, 406 – see e.g., Fig. 4B; i.e., the combination of 402, 404, and 406 corresponds to a single scene of multimedia data within the communication board system). Maurille et al. further teaches exchanging comments on each scene among a plurality of clients (multiple users - see e.g., column 3, line 49 – 65), but does not teach the multimedia electronic tag being described in XML. Dodrill et al. teaches a multimedia electronic tag described in XML (see e.g., column 9, lines 52 - 67 and column 10, lines 1 - 12; i.e., XML tag 104 specifies a session identifier which corresponds to a multimedia electronic tag being described in XML). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the multimedia cooperative system of Maurille et al. with the multimedia electronic tag described in XML of Dodrill et al. because it enables each individual user to have his or her own unique brownie for a given interactive user session (see e.g., column 9, lines 52 - 64).

7. Claims 3, 7, 12, 15, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maurille et al (Patent No. 6,484,196) in view of Kino et al. (Patent No. 6,782,403).

As to independent claim 15, claim 15 differs from claim 12 only in that claim 15 is an apparatus claim using a computer-readable storage medium

(Server Memory 106 – see e.g., Fig. 1) containing programs (application programs 112 - see e.g., column 5, lines 60 - 61) when executed cause a processor (Server Processor 102 – see e.g., Fig. 1) to perform the steps of claim 12. Thus, claim 15 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 12 above.

As to independent claim 7, Maurille et al. teaches a multimedia cooperative work system (communication board system – see e.g., column 2, lines 52 – 58) exchanging a comment on arbitrary multimedia data (MsgText 406 – see e.g., Fig. 4B; i.e., the comments corresponds to user input comments in the communication board system) among a plurality of clients (multiple users - see e.g., column 3, line 49 – 65) through a server (see e.g., column 3, lines 2 – 15; i.e., the communication board system is a client server system), in which the server comprises a multimedia communication unit (Communications Application 117 – see e.g., Fig. 1 and column 6, lines 1 –12; i.e., the Communications Applications 117 resides in Server 100) assigning an identifier to multimedia data (see e.g., column 10, lines 25; i.e., a unique ID or MsgID is generated and assigned to each multimedia data) requested by an arbitrary client (client – see e.g., column 3, lines 2 – 15; i.e., when the client request to generate a comment, a MsgID is assigned to the multimedia data and stored in PMB Database 108) and returning the identifier to the requesting client (see e.g., column 3, lines 58 – 65; i.e., the message information is returned by the server application, which included threaded information).

Maurille et al. teaches a multimedia storage unit storing the multimedia data (PMB Database 108 – see e.g., Fig. 1 and column 6, lines 44 - 57; i.e., the PMB Database stores all the multimedia data), a management unit (Server Memory 106 - see e.g., Fig. 1) obtaining electronic mail (ASP 120 – see e.g., column 6, lines 9 – 12; i.e., ASP 120 is a unit within Server Memory 106 that includes electronic mail), by which the registration requesting client notifies other clients of the identifier of the multimedia data (see e.g., column 11, lines 40 - 64; i.e., recipient/client application displays an alert window that allows the recipient to decide the acceptance of a message), and obtaining member data from a destination address of the electronic mail (see e.g., column 9, lines 14 – 32; i.e., the server application 114 obtains recipient and sender information) and storing the member data in relation to the identifier of the multimedia data (see e.g., column 3, lines 31 – 37; i.e., the server applications stores the sender, recipient, subject and other pertinent information regarding the identifier of the multimedia data).

Maurille et al. teaches an electronic tag model generation unit generating a model of a multimedia electronic tag (see e.g., column 10, lines 18 – 19; i.e., the server application 114 performs the operations listed from 3.4 – 3.14, in which the multimedia electronic tag generation is included in the list of operations) in which a comment can be inputted to each scene (MsgText 406 – see e.g., Fig. 4B; i.e., the comments corresponds to user input comments in the communication board system) obtained by dividing the multimedia data in terms of time (MsgTimeStamp 242 – see e.g., Fig. 4B and column 8, line 37 – 39; i.e.,

each multimedia data comment inputted by individual users invoke “MsgTimeStamp” command, which post different time and date attributes to each post) in tree-shape structure (see e.g., Fig. 4B and column 13, lines 12 – 28; i.e., the comments inputted by the multiple users of the communication board system includes indentations of each comment to show a tree shape hierarchy structure regarding to first, second and third level) based on the multimedia data and the data stored (PMB Database 108 – see e.g., Fig. 1) and managed by the management unit (Server Memory 106 – see e.g., Fig. 1).

Maurille et al. teaches an electronic storage unit (PMB Database 108 – see e.g., Fig.1 and column 6, lines 44 – 47; i.e., the PMB Database 108 stores information written and received by the server) storing the electronic tag model (DisplayNames – see e.g., column 11, lines 11 – 17; i.e., the DisplayNames value is stored in the PMB Database 108 for reference) and also storing the multimedia electronic tag if an arbitrary comment is added based on the electronic tag model (see e.g., column 9, lines 15 – 31; i.e., the storing of the electronic tag is added based on the electronic tag model).

Maurille et al. teaches a client Clinet 150 – see e.g., Fig. 1) includes the registration requester (registers participants – see e.g., column 6, line 33) comprising, an electronic tag communication unit (Applications 164 – see e.g., Fig. 1 and column 7, lines 19 - 24; i.e., applications 164 receives and transmits data to server 100, thus communication is accomplished) obtaining a multimedia electronic tag (Name – see e.g., column 8, line 8; i.e., “Name” is assigned to each user’s account when they register) from the server (Server 100 – see e.g.,

Fig.1; i.e., the Users Table 140 resides in Server 100, therefore Server 100 assigns the electronic tag) using the multimedia data identifier (Id – see e.g., column 8, lines 6 – 7; i.e., “Id” is a unique multimedia data identifier of a user that is automatically assigned as a primary key within the database, therefore any send or request data is associated with “Id”).

Maurille et al. teaches an electronic tag editing unit (Web Browser 168 – see e.g., Fig. 1 and column 7, lines 20 – 23) generating and displaying (see e.g., column 7, lines 20 - 23; i.e., the web browser 168 receives and presents data transmitted by ASP 120) a comment editing screen (Conference Mode Implementation 770 – see e.g., Fig. 7C) by which a comment on an arbitrary scene of multimedia data or a comment on a comment can be inputted (Comment Screen 774 – see e.g., Fig. 7C and column 18, lines 39 - 49; i.e., Comment Screen 774 includes a text box that allows the user to input comments to a scene) using the multimedia electronic tag (see e.g., Fig. 7C; i.e., “Arlene, Mit, and Ulysses” displayed in Comment Screen 774 are multimedia electronic tags which are used to identify the sender/receiver of a comment).

Maurille et al. teaches a synchronous reproduction unit synchronizing/reproducing the multimedia data (see e.g., Fig. 1 and column 7, lines 11 – 18; i.e., Client Processor 152 executes Applications 164 residing in Client Memory 156 to reproduce and synchronize comments). Maurille et al. does not teach a format conversion unit converting data format into a reproducible format.

Kino et al. teaches a format conversion unit (data format conversion unit – see e.g., column 5, lines 32) converting a format into a reproducible format (see e.g., column 5, lines 31 – 37; i.e., the data format conversion unit converts one data format to another reproducible format based on the conversion rules). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the multimedia cooperative work system of Maurille et al. with the format conversion unit of Kino et al. because the data format conversion unit of Kino et al. allows inter-application data transmission, in which data among different types of applications are mutually used among different types of applications (see e.g., column 4, lines 31 – 63; i.e., the advantage of the data format conversion unit allows distinctly different computer code and functions to be used within different application).

As to independent claim 18, Maurille et al. teaches a multimedia electronic tag (DisplayNames – see e.g., column 11, lines 11 – 17) obtained from a server (server application 114 – see e.g., column 11, line 6; i.e., the multimedia electronic tag is assigned to the user by the server application), in which multimedia data (402, 404, 406 – see e.g., Fig. 4B; i.e., the combination of 402, 404, and 406 corresponds to a single scene of multimedia data within the communication board system) corresponding to the multimedia electronic tag (SenderName 245 – see e.g., Fig. 4B) and a comment (MsgText 406 – see e.g., Fig. 4B; i.e., the comments corresponds to user input comments in the communication board system) on each scene of the multimedia data described in the multimedia electronic tag, but does not teach a computer program enabling a

computer to convert a data format. Kino et al. teaches a format conversion unit (data format conversion unit – see e.g., column 5, lines 32) converting a format into a reproducible format (see e.g., column 5, lines 31 – 37; i.e., the data format conversion unit converts one data format to another reproducible format based on the conversion rules). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the multimedia cooperative work system of Maurille et al. with the format conversion unit of Kino et al. because the data format conversion unit of Kino et al. allows inter-application data transmission, in which data among different types of applications are mutually used among different types of applications (see e.g., column 4, lines 31 – 63; i.e., the advantage of the data format conversion unit allows distinctly different computer code and functions to be used within different application).

As to dependent claim 3, Maurille et al. teaches a multimedia cooperative work system (communication board system - see e.g., column 2, lines 52 - 58), including the generation of a multimedia electronic tag models (DisplayNames – see e.g., column 11, lines 11 – 17; i.e., the generation of UserIDs “U007, U019 and U027” corresponds to names “Arnie, Robert and SueEllen” displayed on the communication board system respectively) that display comments (MsgText 406 – see e.g., Fig. 4B; i.e., the comments corresponds to user input comments in the communication board system) and attribute data, (MsgTimeStamp 242 – see e.g., Fig. 4B and column 8, line 37 – 39; i.e., wherein the date and time corresponds to the attribute) which is tree-shaped structured (see e.g., Fig. 4B

and column 13, lines 12 – 28; i.e., the comments inputted by the multiple users of the communication board system includes indentations of each comment to show a tree shape hierarchy structure regarding to first, second and third level) for each scene of multimedia data (402, 404, 406 – see e.g., Fig. 4B; i.e., the combination of 402, 404, and 406 corresponds to a single scene of multimedia data within the communication board system). Maurille et al. further teaches exchanging comments on each scene among a plurality of clients (multiple users - see e.g., column 3, line 49 – 65), wherein the multimedia data can be synchronized/reproduced (see e.g., Fig. 4B), but does not teach a format conversion unit that converts data. Kino et al. teaches a format conversion unit (see e.g., Fig. 35 and column 5, lines 32 – 37). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the multimedia cooperative work system of Maurille et al. with the format conversion unit of Kino et al. because the conversion unit that is incorporated into the application specifically achieves the object of mutual use of data between different types of applications (see e.g., column 4, lines 31 – 52).

As to dependent claim 12, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 3 and claim 11. Maurille et al. teaches a communication unit (web browser 168 - see e.g., column 7, line 21) for transmitting/receiving data (receives/transmits - see e.g., column 7, line 21) to/from a server (server application 114 - see e.g., column 7, line 23) through a network (network – see e.g., column 6, lines 58 – 67). Maurille et al. further teaches a multimedia synchronous reproduction unit for synchronizing and displaying (see e.g., Fig. 1

and column 6, lines 44 – 57; i.e., the Applications 112 residing in Server Memory 106 are responsible for reproducing and displaying the multimedia data by using the PMB Database 108 for synchronizing the multimedia data) comments (MsgText 406 – see e.g., Fig. 4B; i.e., the comments corresponds to user input comments in the communication board system) corresponding to each scene of the multimedia data (402, 404, 406 – see e.g., Fig. 4B; i.e., the combination of 402, 404, and 406 corresponds to a single scene of multimedia data within the communication board system). Kino et al. teaches a conversion unit which converts data formats (see e.g., Fig. 35 and column 5, lines 32 – 37). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Maurille et al's reference with Kino et al's reference as previously stated above.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Prior art Patent No. 6,769,012 can be applicable and pertinent art to the applicant's disclosure. Prior art disclosed by Liu et al. teaches a messaging system with a tree-shape structure and attribute data.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry Vu whose telephone number is (571)270-1048. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chanh Nguyen can be reached on (571) 270-1048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Examiner's Name: Henry Vu

Examiner's Signature: Henry Vu

Date: 9/6/2006


CHANH D. NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER